



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,638	08/25/2003	Joshy Joseph	POU920030044US1	3890
7590 Cantor Colburn LLP 55 Griffin Road South Bloomfield, CT 06002				
EXAMINER				
PATEL, CHIRAG R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2454				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/29/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,638

Applicant(s)

JOSEPH, JOSH Y

Examiner

CHIRAG R. PATEL

Art Unit

2454

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-15 and 31-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-15 and 31-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 9, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicants arguments that Worden is silent as to any of the features of OSGA, examiner asserted in the office action that MDL (meaning definition language) exhibits the same functionality as OSDML Service Data Mapping Language (OSDML) as applicants stated in the recited claim language that "OSDML is an extensible markup language (XML)". Woorden discloses per [0029], "The set of mappings between an XML language and a class model may be embodied in an XML form called Meaning Definition Language(MDL)". Examiner has read the claims in light of applicant's disclosure which discloses per abstract, "an embodiment of the present invention describes a XML language referred to hereinafter as an OGSA Service Data mapping Language (OSDML) that includes features to support any data/resource sources and to support complex mapping through extensible language features."

In response to applicant's arguments that the claimed "native resource representation" of OGSA service is not the same as a "business information model" of XML logical structures as discussed in Woorden, examiner points to Woorden which supports native representations per [0031], "The key benefit of mappings is: If applications are interfaced to XML via mappings (which are read by software as data, not 'hard-coded' in software), then any application can be adapted to a new XML language by simply using the mappings (i.e. data) for the new language, without changing software, and per [0033] "Meaning-level query language: queries are stated in

terms of the class model. The query tool retrieves data from an XML file via the mappings, so (a) users do not need to know about XML structure, (b) the same query can be run against multiple XML languages." It is a native representation because Worden discloses per [0044], "This information is then displayed to the user, answering the query. The code written in a high level language allows users to submit queries in terms which reflect the logical structures of the business information model, not requiring knowledge of the structure of an XML language, and the translation layer allows a document in an XML based language to be queried, using the mappings of that XML language onto the business information model."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-15, and 31-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Worden (US 2003/0149934).

As per claims 1 and 31, Lucas discloses a method for implementing complex mapping of Open Grid Services Architecture (OSGA) service data, the method comprising:

defining a set of standard mapping rules for service data descriptions in a service oriented architecture; ([0702])

wherein said set of standard mapping rules are implemented through an OSGA Service Data Mapping Language (OSDML) configured to implement mapping of the OSGA service data to a native resource representation thereof, ([0031]-[0033], [0044]) through extensible language features; ([0028]-[0029]; XML form called Meaning Definition Language,(MDL), is interpreted as OSDML as it exhibits same functionality)

wherein said OSDML is an extensible markup language (XML); and ([0029])

defining a flexible framework engine for processing rules and mappings defined by said OSMDL. ([0702])

As per claims 3 and 32, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said OSDML defines an extensible set of at least one of: data source mechanisms and resource access mechanisms. ([1035])

As per claims 4 and 33, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said OSDML defines parameterization capabilities for supporting dynamic values. ([0389])

As per claims 5 and 34, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said OSDML defines executable scripts to process data transformation and queries. ([0295]-[0297])

As per claims 6 and 35, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said OSDML defines a mechanism for defining private mapping for an internal state of a service. ([0201])

As per claims 7 and 36, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said OSDML defines a set of rules for defining and mapping service data change notification subscriptions from a corresponding native resource implementation thereof. ([0352])

As per claims 9 and 37, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said framework engine includes a uniform interface to services implementation. ([0071])

As per claims 10 and 38, Lucas discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said framework engine includes a pluggable provider interface, said pluggable provider interface being configured to support language extensions and new service data providers. ([0492])

As per claims 11 and 39, Lucas discloses the method of claim 10, wherein said framework engine is configured to support at least one of: parameterization, flexible data source binding and pluggable script execution. ([0054])

As per claims 12 and 40, Lucas discloses the method of claim 10, wherein said framework engine further comprises a document repository. ([0553])

As per claims 13 and 41, Lucas discloses the method of claim 10, wherein said framework engine further comprises a generic interface for supporting OSDML instance data retrieval. ([0553])

As per claims 14 and 42, Lucas discloses the method of claim 10, wherein said pluggable provider interface comprises at least one of: a common information object manager (CIMOM) and a database adapter. ([0555])

As per claims 15 and 43, Lucas discloses the method of claim 10, wherein said framework engine is configured to map service data definitions to relational database schema. ([0545])

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00AM to 4:30PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn, can be reached on (571) 272-1915.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pairedirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

/C. R. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2454

/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454